





PUBLIC MEETING

Utah Committee of Consumer Services

Utah Department of Commerce January 29, 2009







Welcome & Business





Public Comment







Michele Beck







Overview

- To date, 15 bills and bill requests that relate to issues relevant to the Committee
- In addition, other bills are rumored
- Many of these require no action from the Committee
- Others warrant varying levels of response







Framework

- The Committee must consider both its workload and legislative priorities
- Our voice will be more respected if we "choose our battles"
 - Recognize limited political capital
- Where possible, we focus on working behind the scenes with key parties to work out our concerns







Discussion of Legislation Matrix





Rocky Mountain Power New Large Resource Acquisition: Lake Side 2 Analysis

Cheryl Murray







Resource Description

- 607 MW combined cycle combustion turbine
- Located on Lake Side site (former Geneva Steel site)
- Anticipated online date: July 2012





CCS Analysis of Resource Selection

- Our consultant, Phil Hayet, has found no "red flags" regarding the Lake Side 2 resource
- Lake Side 2 does appear to be the "least cost" resource coming out of RFP 2012
 - However, it is a high cost resource
- The RFP process relies heavily on the Independent Evaluator, so did we
 - Both IEs (OR and UT) found this to be the least cost resource from the 2012 RFP
 - OR IE found (a) price of winning bid is consistent with current market condition and (b) current system forecasts show the need for capacity remains. Cautions that he does not provide a complete, precise analysis.







CCS Conflicting Considerations

- Concern that we may be buying at the "top of the market"
- Concern about contractual terms that impose too much risk on the consumers
- Seems unlikely that the resource can actually be complete by July 2012
 - Again leaves customers at risk from over reliance on the market
 - Cost of supply and availability of supply
- These concerns must be balanced against the recognition of PacifiCorp's significant resource deficits in 2012 and beyond







Additional Considerations

- We expect the recently received bids from the 2008
 RFP to help inform the process
 - Providing type, cost and on-line dates of potential future resources
- RMP hopes to incorporate early results of 2008 RFP in its February 12 rebuttal testimony and present more information at the February 19 Lake Side 2 hearing
- Does not provide adequate time for parties to analyze results







Questar Rate Case: Requests for Reconsideration

Eric Orton







Questar's Request for Reconsideration

- An \$11.2M disparity between Commission awarded rates and rates collected from the rate design Order
- The removal of Wexpro gas from NGV rates.
- The implementation of NGV rates in two steps
 - No opposition to the first step halfway to cost of service
 - Objection to the second step all the way to cost of service







The Numbers Behind Questar's Request

- \$11 M difference between the two Commission orders
 - Questar was awarded a revenue of \$245M
 - Only \$233M was awarded based on the rates the Commission ordered
- The Commission knows that the Company can collect that money through the CET mechanism. The Company wants the other route.







NGV / Wexpro and Timing

- Questar contends:
 - Wexpro is a gas supply issue and may be more properly addressed in the 191 – Pass-Through filings, not in rate cases.
 - Changing rates now and again in July is problematic.
 - Moving all the way to cost of service for NGV may not be consistent with Governor's policy







Roger Ball's Request for Reconsideration

The elimination of the GSS and EAC rates.







CCS Positions

- CCS is analyzing the validity of Questar's assertions regarding the numbers
- We took no position regarding the use of Wexpro gas
 - CCS anticipated Wexpro issue would be examined in the upcoming NGV docket.
- We support taking the NGV rate to full cost of service eventually.
- We took no position regarding eliminating the GSS/EAC rates.







Rocky Mountain Power 2008 Rate Case

Cheryl Murray







Cost of Capital - ROE

- Last RMP rate case positions of parties
 - RMP 10.75%
 - DPU 10.1%
 - CCS 9.85%
 - PSC Ordered 10.25%







Cost of Capital – Current Case

DESCRIPTION	RMP		DPU		CCS	
	Structure	Cost	Structure	Cost	Structure	Cost
Long-Term Debt	48.2%	6.23%	48.81%	6.07%	48.2%	6.08%
Preferred Stock	.03%	5.41%	0.37%	5.41%	.03%	5.41%
Common Equity	51.5%	11%	50.82%	10.75%	51.5%	10%







Revenue Requirement – Summary

- Larkin & Associates have been retained as CCS consultants
- Randall Falkenberg and Phil Hayet will again be our Net Power Cost consultants for this case
- The Test Year order required the Company to refile the case on December 6
- Short time to complete analysis and file testimony, which is due February 12, 2009







Revenue Requirement - NPC

- Most CCS adjustments are likely to be in the Net Power Cost area
- Areas of examination:
 - Issues where Company has not complied with PSC orders in last rate case
 - Issues where the Company presents arguments or new evidence to change what the PSC ordered
 - Issues that the PSC indicated in their last Order weren't addressed to their satisfaction
 - New issues







Revenue Requirement – Rate Base

- Focus will be more on rate base issues than expenses
 - The Company made typical expense adjustments from base year to test year (escalation, wage increases, normalization adjustments, etc.) then reduced the result by \$50.6M
 - Rate Base Utilities investment in plant on which it earns a return
- We are also looking at advertising expense
 - Rate payers should only pay for advertising that provides benefits such as safety messages
 - Certain types of advertising such as Blue Sky and energy efficiency are charged to specific funds





Closed Session





Open Session







Other Business/Adjourn